UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,938	10/15/2001	Tetsuro Motoyama	205850US-2	2679

22850	7590	01/26/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td colspan="2">Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">09/975,938</td><td>MOTOYAMA ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td colspan="2">Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>David E. England</td><td colspan="2">2143</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 November 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/15/2002</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 14 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1 – 5, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hansen (6757714) in view of Hung (6772143) in further view of Narurkar et al. (6711624)

(hereinafter Narurkar).

4.   As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen teaches a system for

remotely monitoring a device, the system including:

5.   A) a receiver manager class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"customer relation ship*

management system software"), and

6.   B) a data retriever, the data retriever including:

7.   i) a data retriever class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"XML parser"*),

8.   ii) an email processor, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"e-mail program"*), and

9.   iii) a parser, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10);

10.   a method of receiving information concerning the remotely monitored device, the

information being contained in a message that also includes a message type designation, the

method comprising:

11.   a) the data retriever class invoking a function in the email processor to read a first line

and to read a second line from the message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 43 – 55);

12.   b) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to parse the first line of the

message to extract the message type designation, (e.g. col. 6, lines 52 – 65);

13.   c) the data retriever class returning the extracted message type designation to the receiver

manager class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10); but does not specifically teach d) the

receiver manager class determining a data structure definition based on the extracted message

type designation and passing the data structure definition to the data retriever class; and

14.   e) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to extract a data type and a

data value from the second line and store the extracted data value in a data structure of the

determined data structure type at a location in a memory corresponding to the extracted data

type.

15.   Hung teaches d) the receiver manager class determining a data structure type based on the

extracted message type designation and passing the data structure type to the data retriever class,

(e.g., col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 13); and

16.   store the extracted data value in a data structure of the determined data structure type at a

location in a memory corresponding to the extracted data type, (e.g., col. 10, line 66 – col. 11,

line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine Hung with Hansen because when newly added declarations have been

recorded and are available for subsequent lookup. Furthermore, parsing alone is insufficient since interfaces can be dependent upon constant expressions, which can themselves depend upon the sizes of type definitions that are held in a manager type module.

17.   Narurkar teaches e) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to extract a data type and a data value from the second line, (e.g. col. 17, line 62 – col. 18, line 22 & col. 19, lines 51 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Narurkar with the combine system of Hansen and Hung because parsing module would collapse multiple successive spaces on each of the text lines into single spaces therefore saving space for the insertion of other parsed information to be inserted.

18.   As per claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen teaches the message is transmitted over the Internet using an Internet email protocol, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10).

19.   Claims 1 – 4 and 9 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20.   Claims 6 – 8 and 10 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen, Hung and Narurkar as applied to claims 5 & 9 above, and in further view of Hall et al. (5826023) (hereinafter Hall).

21.   As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen, Hung and Narurkar do

not specifically teach the message is included in an email message received by a Post Office

Protocol 3 (POP3) server; and

22.   the email processor includes functions to interface to the POP3 server.

23.   Hall teaches the message is included in an email message received by a Post Office

Protocol 3 (POP3) server; and the email processor includes functions to interface to the POP3

server, (e.g. col. 4, lines 25 – 41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine Hall with the combine system of Hansen, Hung and

Narurkar because clients that are making use of the POP3 server support be allowed to move

mail through a SNADS network to other POP3 clients.

24.   As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen teaches the message is

included in an attachment to the email, (e.g. col. 4, line 58 – col. 5, line 9).

25.   As per claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen, Hung and Narurkar do

not specifically teach the attachment is a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME)

attachment. Hall teaches the attachment is a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME)

attachment, (e.g. col. 6, lines 8 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine Hall with the combine system of Hansen,

Hung and Narurkar because MIME enables them to send and receive formatted non-ASCII

messages similar to graphics, audio, and video files such as GIF graphics files and PostScript

files via the Internet mail system. In addition, MIME supports messages in <u>character sets</u> other

than ASCII.

26.   Claims 8 and 10 – 12 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

27.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen, Hung

and Narurkar as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Smith et al. (6192282)

(hereinafter Smith)

28.   As per claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen, Hung and Narurkar

teach all that is similarly claimed above as it applies herein, but does not specifically teach the

message type designation representing one of configuration information, device information, and

status information of the remotely monitored device. Smith the message type designation

representing one of configuration information, device information, and status information of the

remotely monitored device, (e.g., col. 16, lines 14 – 56). It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Smith with the combine system of

Hansen, Hung and Narurkar because it would be advantageous for a system to transfer

information about specific node to aid in finding error and/or status information about the

specific node as transmitted with a message.

Response to Arguments

29.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 14 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendments and a new claim.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

                                                        David E. England
                                                        Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2143

DE

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100